

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Defendant-Appellant James F. Ruble is appealing from the revocation of his probation.

We affirm.

ISSUE

Ruble states the issue as: “[whether] the order of sentence, under the circumstances of this case, is manifestly unreasonable.”

FACTS

Ruble entered a guilty plea to the Class D felony of check fraud. He was sentenced to three years imprisonment, which was suspended. He was placed on home detention for six months followed by thirty months of supervised probation. The State filed a petition for violation of probation alleging, among other things, that Ruble violated his probation by consuming alcohol and twice using cocaine. He also refused to take a urine screen and he failed to pay for home detention and urine screen fees associated with his probation. At the hearing to revoke his probation, Ruble admitted the transgression of his probation conditions. The trial court sentenced him to the remainder of his sentence of three years.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION

Ruble misstates the issue in that the manifestly unreasonable standard is no longer applicable. Ind. Appellate Rule 7(B) provides that the court on review may revise a sentence authorized by statute if, after due consideration of the trial court’s decision, this

court finds that the sentence is inappropriate in light of the nature of the offense and the character of the offender.

The authorities cited by Ruble are either obsolete, inapplicable, repealed or replaced by other authorities. Ind. Appellate Rule 46(A)(8)(a) provides the argument must contain the contentions of the appellant on the issues presented, the argument must be supported by cogent reasoning, and each contention must be supported by citations to the authorities, statutes, and the Appendix or parts of the Record on Appeal relied on, in accordance with Rule 22.

We are of the opinion that Ruble's argument is not cogent.

CONCLUSION

The issue is waived. Judgment affirmed.

BAKER, C.J., and CRONE, J., concur.